

Beach Cities Watershed Management Group Meeting
March 8, 2016
Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Geraldine Trivedi (City of RB), John Dettle (City of Torrance), Raul Saenz (City of Manhattan Beach), TJ Moon (LACFCD), Michelle Reed (LACFCD), Kathleen McGowan (McGowan Consulting), Susan Robinson (McGowan Consulting)

1. EWMP Implementation MOU

- a. The group discussed project sequencing of the projects modelled in the EWMP. It was agreed that the group will initially focus efforts on the Santa Monica Bay watershed because the final compliance dates in this watershed are more pressing (2021)
 - i. For the Santa Monica Bay Watershed final compliance was demonstrated in the model through the following combination of BMPs:
 1. SMB 5-02 subwatershed (28th Street in Manhattan Beach):
 - a. Manhattan Beach Infiltration Trench regional project trench (high priority project for SMB 5-02 drainage area)
 - b. Polliwog Park infiltration system (alternative if Manhattan Beach Infiltration system cannot be feasibly sized to meet all the needed load reduction)
 - c. Distributed Green Streets to address 5% of the tributary area
 2. SMB 6-01/BC Sump subwatershed (Herondo)
 - a. Hermosa Greenbelt Infiltration Project (high priority project for the SMB 6-01/BC Sump drainage area)
 - b. Park #3 Infiltration Project
 - c. Hermosa Beach Infiltration Trench
 - d. Distributed green streets to address 25% of the tributary area

Note: Torrance's basin projects were included in the modeling for SMB 6-01/BC Sump because they did not meet the 85th percentile storm capture requirement and as such the Regional Board guidelines required they be included in RAA
 - ii. Final compliance is demonstrated at the downstream monitoring compliance point of each subwatershed, therefore not all of these projects may need to be constructed if the data shows compliance once the prioritized projects are implemented.
- b. The group began to discuss EWMP Implementation cost sharing
 - i. McGowan Consulting presented a handout prepared by Geosyntec showing each agency's tributary area to each regional BMP identified in the EWMP for the Santa Monica Bay watershed
 1. Torrance does not agree with the Park 3 drainage area delineation

- a. Geosyntec and Torrance need to discuss this drainage area and correct any issues
 - 2. LACFCD will have a policy in place soon to guide which type of projects they will contribute to financially
 - a. Another option is for LACFCD to contribute in kind through permit fee waivers, plan review fee waivers, etc.
 - ii. Cost share options for regional projects:
 - 1. Create a Joint powers authority for all projects
 - 2. Distribute costs based on area draining to each project
 - 3. Distribute costs by watershed area based on percent area share in each watershed area (i.e., 6-01/BC Sump)

Public Works Directors will be meeting to discuss how cost share might work
- 2. Prop 1 Coastal Conservancy Grant application being prepared by Blais and Associates
 - a. The group agreed to submit grant application for engineering and planning design cost without CEQA and permitting cost included, which totals \$1.125 million, with a 52% match of \$600K and a grant request of \$525K
 - b. The group will also need to work out how the cost share for matching funds will be distributed among the agencies
 - i. The group wants to be clear that this cost sharing formula will not set a precedent for the EWMP Implementation MOU cost share
 - ii. The group will brief their Public Works Directors on the grant application and ask them to agree to a cost share based on drainage to the SMB 6-01 outfall
 - c. Group needs to decide who will be lead on the project and how cost share will work for match. Redondo Beach thinks that Hermosa Beach should be the lead because the site in Hermosa Beach is more likely to be selected than the Redondo Beach site under the Edison power line due to Edison access issues
 - i. McGowan Consulting will check with Hermosa Beach to see if they will be the lead agency
- 3. Recap of Regional Board EWMP workshop
 - a. The NGOs presented and their major comment is that they want a written response to their comments on the draft EWMPs
 - i. They also said they would petition conditional approvals of the EWMPs—believe that the Executive Officer must either approve or disapprove, not conditionally approve
 - b. Each EWMP group presented
 - i. There were no comments or questions from the Regional Board
 - ii. City of LA presented the amount of water that will be conserved through EWMP efforts
 - 1. Every group has agreed to provide the Regional Board estimates of the water captured through their EWMP efforts by March 31st
 - 2. Redondo Beach will direct Geosyntec to submit this figure to the Regional Board

4. LA IRWMP database submittal of projects
 - a. Optional Prop 1 Storm Water Implementation grant pre-application due April 15th. This is a FFAST application, which will tell applicants whether they have a chance at receiving grant money
 - b. The final Prop 1 Implementation grant is due July 8, with another round expected next year
 - c. Clean Beaches grant has a separate pot of money (~\$25M) for clean beaches that only the coastal cities can apply for within the Prop 1 Storm Water grant funding
 - d. The group has to submit EWMP projects to IRWMP OPTI database to be eligible for Prop 1 Stormwater Implementation grant funding for EWMP projects
 - i. LA County is combining their EWMP, CIMP, and IRWMP to create their Storm Water Resource Plan and submitting it to the State to ask whether it is sufficient
 - ii. McGowan Consulting has scope of work to submit Beach Cities EWMP projects into OPTI database
 1. According to LACFCD then we need to get EWMP incorporated into IRWMP within 90 days after grant is approved
 2. LACFCD will clarify this timeline
 - iii. The group also needs to send a representative to attend the South Bay Steering Committee and IRWMP Leadership meetings to present EWMP projects and answer questions
5. Coordinated outreach/programmatic implementation
 - a. The group needs to decide whether to include joint outreach activities in the EWMP Implementation MOU
 - i. Outreach requirements can be met through a county-wide program OR with watershed based program OR individually by each agency
 - ii. LA County will confirm which outreach activities they will be continuing, and how long they are planning to continue these activities
 - iii. McGowan Consulting presented a matrix of required outreach activities that could be implemented jointly
 1. The group will review the spreadsheet and get back at next meeting with recommendation for which activities they want to include
 - b. One option is to create a general EWMP Implementation MOU including outreach and coordinated programmatic activities with an outline of the cost sharing formula for projects, but develop a separate MOU for each project
6. Next Meeting - April 12

Action Items:

1. Torrance and Geosyntec need to discuss Park 3 project drainage area
2. The group will brief their Public Works Directors on the Prop 1 Coastal Conservancy grant application and ask them to agree to a cost share based on drainage to the SMB 6-01/BC Sump outfall

3. McGowan Consulting will check with Hermosa Beach to see if they will be the lead agency for the Prop 1 Coastal Conservancy grant since the project will be constructed in their jurisdiction
4. Redondo Beach will direct Geosyntec to submit estimate of water conserved through EWMP efforts to the Regional Board by March 31, 2016
5. LACFCD will clarify timeline for submitting EWMP projects into the IRWMP OPTI database
6. The group will review the outreach matrix and come up with recommendations for joint implementation by the April meeting